

In re Application of: Sullivan
Application No.: 10/058,607
Atty Docket No.: 61750.03US1

Examiner: J. Zerr
Art Unit: 3644

REMARKS

In the present Application, originally-submitted Claims 6-9 have been cancelled. By this Response, Claims 11, 13 and 37 have been amended. Thus, the pending Claims in this Application are Claims 10-17 and 37.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has objected to the drawings under 37 CFR § 1.83(a) as not showing every feature of the present invention specified in the Claims. Applicant has cancelled the features of the Claims not illustrated in the drawings. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests this objection be removed.

Also in the Office Action, the Examiner has objected to the specification as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. Applicant respectfully requests that the cancellation of Claims 6, 8 and 9 render the objections moot.

Claims 37 and 6-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Benkoe*, U.S. Patent No. 3,022,779. In a previous Office Action, the Examiner stated that Claim 5 would be allowable if rewritten in Independent Form, including all limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims therein. To this end, Applicant has amended Claim 37 to include all the limitations of original Claim 5. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests this rejection be removed.

Finally, Applicant has made additional amendments to the Claims (specifically, Claims 11 and 13) for ease in reading those particular Claims.

Applicant submits that any amendments to the Claims that were not made in response to the Examiner's objections or rejections were made for non-statutory purposes. Accordingly, any such amendments should not limit the scope of the invention, which is to be given the full breadth of the claim language and any equivalents thereof.

Based on the foregoing Amendments and Remarks, the present Application is considered to be in condition for allowance. Such action on the part of the Examiner is respectfully requested. If the Examiner feels a telephonic conference would expedite

In re Application of: Sullivan
Application No.: 10/058,607
Atty Docket No.: 61750.03US1

Examiner: J. Zerr
Art Unit: 3644

the allowance of the present Application, it is suggested the Examiner contact the undersigned Attorney.

It is further believed that a one-month extension of time fee is due for the filing of this Response. The Office is permitted to charge any deficiencies or refund any overpayments to our firm's Deposit Account No. 502261.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 27 February 2004



Timothy M. Morella
Reg. No. 45,277

NEAL, GERBER & EISENBERG LLP
2 North LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60602 3801
312 269 8000

Certificate of Mailing under 37 CFR § 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this document is being transmitted to the Commissioner for Patents *via facsimile at 703 872 9306*, this 27th Day of February, 2004.

By: 

Lisa A. Lyle

NGEDOC5 :970006.1